

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Daniel E. Hall, Plaintiff,
v.
Twitter Inc., Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-536-SE

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO REPLY TO TWITTER, INC.'S
OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECUSAL**

Plaintiff, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(e)(2), moves, for leave to file a reply to Defendant's Objection [Doc. 109] to the Plaintiff's [Doc. 104] "Motion" for Recusal.

1. Plaintiff seeks leave to file a reply to rebut Twitter's factual and legal arguments contained within its objection.

2. Plaintiff does not file a memorandum of law herewith as all authority in support of its objection is cited herein.

3. Contrary to Twitter's Objections, Judge Elliott investigated and re-hired Judge Johnstone through an administrative proceeding. She has knowledge learned outside Plaintiff's case, has a pre-disposition to the Plaintiff's claims presented within [Doc's, 100, 101 and 102], that Judge Johnstone promulgated her own unofficial rules, which benefitted Twitter and it's Perkins Coie attorneys. Recusal is appropriate.

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court allow Plaintiff to reply to Twitters objections.

Respectfully,

/s/ Daniel E. Hall
Aka, Sensa Verogna
SensaVerogna@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Daniel E. Hall, certify that on this date I electronically filed the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to the Defendants counsel of record, Jonathan M. Eck and Julie E. Schwartz, Esq., and Indraneel Sur, Lead Attorney for U.S. DOJ.

/s/Daniel E. Hall
Plaintiff